

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

GREGORY LYLE BRIDGES,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR15-181 MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
INTERVENE

The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed:

1. Motion to Intervene and to Order Production of Records (Dkt. No. 74),
2. Government's Response to Motion to Intervene and to Order Production of Records (Dkt. No. 77),
3. Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Intervene and to Order Production of Records (Dkt. No. 78),

all attached declarations and exhibits, and relevant portions of the record, rules as follows:

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

1 This motion is brought by counsel for Carter Jesness, a victim of Defendant's criminal
2 sexual activity and the plaintiff in a civil suit against Defendant (Jesness v. Bridges, C18-
3 1225RSM). Liability in the civil matter has been established via summary judgment (based on
4 the criminal conviction) and trial on the issue of damages is pending; a bench proceeding is
5 currently set before the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez of this district on November 16, 2020.

6 Mr. Jesness' request of this Court is twofold: (1) to permit Mr. Jesness to intervene in
7 this criminal proceeding and (2) to order the Government to "produce the discovery in this
8 matter concerning Bridges' crimes against Carter Jesness in order to assist in the preparation of
9 the damages trial scheduled before Judge Martinez." (Dkt. No. 74, Motion at 14.)

10 Mr. Jesness' counsel cites FRCP 24(b)(1)(B) as authority for his client's right to
11 intervene in this case. The problem (as the Government points out) is that this rule of federal
12 *civil* procedure says nothing about intervention in criminal matters. It is, in fact, the general rule
13 in the Ninth Circuit that "individuals lack standing to intervene in criminal prosecutions." U.S.
14 v. Van Dyck, 866 F.3d 1130, 1133 (9th Cir. 2017), *citing* Linda R.S. v. Richard D. and Texas,
15 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973).

16 There are a host of other problems with this motion, ranging from its vague and possibly
17 overbroad nature, compliance issues related to evidence of child pornography and grand jury
18 materials, and questions about why counsel chose not to simply enforce Judge Martinez's order
19 compelling production of this material or subpoena it within the civil proceeding. All these
20 issues are moot in face of Mr. Jesness' inability to establish his right to intervene herein.

21 This Court joins the Government in expressing its hope that Mr. Jesness is able to
22 vindicate his rights and achieve all the compensation to which he is entitled. This must be
23 accomplished, however, within the framework established for the just and orderly administration
24

1 of civil litigation. Mr. Jesness has not succeeded in establishing that intervention in his abuser's
2 criminal proceeding is among the rights accorded him in this process.

3 The motion to intervene and to order production of records in the above-entitled matter is
4 DENIED.

5
6 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Defendant and to all counsel.

7 Dated April 30, 2020.

8 

9 Marsha J. Pechman
10 United States Senior District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24